

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **I. Amendments to the Specification**

As mentioned above, paragraphs [0020] and [0033] of the specification have been amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

### **II. Amendments to the Drawings**

As mentioned above, a proposed drawing amendment is submitted herewith under a separate cover letter. Specifically, Figure 9 has been amended to replace the term “13n” with the term “13m.” No new matter has been added.

### **III. Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

Further, new claims 16-20 have been added to clarify features of the invention and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below. Support for the limitations recited in new claims 16-20 can be found, at least, in Figs. 2 and 4-8 and the related descriptions of the specification.

#### **IV. 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph Rejection**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is considered moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 15. Further, this rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to new claims 16-20, since claims 16-20 have been drafted based on Figs. 2 and 4-8 and the related written description of the specification. As a result, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **V. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Alkove, Stefik, and Official Notice. This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 15 and is believed clearly inapplicable to new claims 16-20 for the following reasons.

New independent claim 16 recites a content distribution system including a server (that stores content containing a plurality of resources) and a receiving terminal. In addition, claim 16 recites that at least one of the resources of the content includes other-content link information for accessing a resource contained in another content, such that the other-content link information describes information referring to a startup document of the another content, and recites that at least one of the resources of the content includes self-content link information for accessing a resource contained in the content, such that the self-content link information describes information referring to the resource for which the self-content link information is for accessing.

Furthermore, according to the structure required by claim 16, when the receiving terminal is given an instruction to switch a view target based on the other-content link information, (i) the

receiving terminal requests a startup document of the another content referred to by the other-content link information, (ii) the server transmits (to the receiving terminal) the startup document of the another content and the receiving terminal acquires (from the server) a view license corresponding to license identification information described in a piece of license information included in the received startup document of the another content and stores the acquired view license, (iii) decryption of the a resource is performed based on the stored view license, and (iv) the decrypted resource is presented.

On the other hand, according to the structure required by claim 16, when the receiving terminal is given an instruction to switch a view target based on the self-content link information, (i) the receiving terminal requests a resource of the content, (ii) the receiving terminal has already stored (when using the resource of the content) all of the view licenses used for all of the resources contained in the content, (iii) decryption of the requested resource is performed using the stored information, and the decrypted resource is presented.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) does not rely on Stefik and/or Alkove for teaching the above-mentioned distinguishing features required by new claim 16. As a result, it is difficult for the Applicants to determine which, if any, portions of the Stefik and/or Alkove references the Examiner is likely to compare to the claimed invention. However, the Applicants submit that no portion of Stefik and/or Alkove disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features required by claim 16.

Specifically, the Applicants note that Stefik merely teaches a method of controlling usage rights of digital works, such that desired data can be accessed by referring to and according to previously set rights information (see Figs. 7-11); and Alkove merely teaches communicating a data file and a license to an end user (see Fig. 1 and paragraph [0019]).

Thus, in view of the above, even though Alkove teaches communicating a data file and a license, and Stefik teaches controlling usage rights of digital works according to previously set rights information, any combination of Alkove and Stefik fails to disclose or suggest (A) when the receiving terminal is given an instruction to switch a view target based on the other-content link information, (i) the receiving terminal requests a startup document of the another content referred to by the other-content link information, (ii) the server transmits (to the receiving terminal) the startup document of the another content and the receiving terminal acquires (from the server) a view license corresponding to license identification information described in a piece of license information included in the received startup document of the another content and stores the acquired view license, (iii) decryption of the a resource is performed based on the stored view license, and (iv) the decrypted resource is presented, and (B) when the receiving terminal is given an instruction to switch a view target based on the self-content link information, (i) the receiving terminal requests a resource of the content, (ii) the receiving terminal has already stored (when using the resource of the content) all of the view licenses used for all of the resources contained in the content, (iii) decryption of the requested resource is performed using the stored information, and the decrypted resource is presented, as required by claim 1

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that new independent claim 16 would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Alkove and Stefik.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Alkove and/or Stefik or elsewhere in the prior art of record that would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Alkove and/or Stefik to obtain the invention of independent claim 16. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 16 is clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

New independent claims 17, 18, 19 and 20 are directed to a server, a receiving terminal, a program, and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 16. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 17, 18, 19 and 20 are allowable over any combination of Alkove and Stefik.

## **VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tatsuya SHIMOJI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2009.11.20 16:03:42 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
November 20, 2009